

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-39 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants note with appreciation that the subject matter of these claims is deemed to be allowable if rewritten to include all limitations of the superseding and rejected claims. Applicants wish to reserve the right to prosecute these claims should further discussion prove unrewarding.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0051432 to Shin in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0037758 to Rimoni. Applicants have amended independent claim 9 to further define the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The claims are directed to handing over a call of a wireless communication unit from a first communication network to a second communication network. To make the handover, the claims initiate a handover call while the first call is ongoing. The handover call is made to a separate handover number that terminates on a device that is in the first communication network while the wireless communication unit is on the second communication network. The handover number is used to facilitate the handover of the first call's ongoing communication.

The Office Action cites Shin against the "obtaining a handover number that terminates on a mobility manager associated with the first communication network" found in independent claims 1, 9 and 23. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on Shin for the reasons expressed in pages 7 and 8 of the Appeal Brief filed on September 25, 2006. Even though Rimoni refers to a handover number, Rimoni's handover number also does not terminate on a mobility manager associated with the first

communication network. Instead, Rimoni's handover number terminates on a mobile switching center associated with the second communication network. See steps 907 and 908 in paragraphs [0373]-[0374]. Therefore, neither Shin nor Rimoni teach the claimed element. In fact, Shin and Rimoni teach away from having the handover number is terminating on the mobility manager associated with the first communication network. Both references consistently teach and suggest that the handover number is terminated on the second communication network. Thus, it is not obvious to the person of ordinary skilled in the art to relocate where the handover number terminates to the first communication network.

According to the Office Action, the controller of the wireless communication unit of claims 1 and 9 are equated to a gateway control station (32) in a gateway station (30). Thus, the claimed wireless communication unit is still being equated to the gateway station. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons provided on page 7 of the Appeal Brief. Similarly, it appears from the paragraph citing Rimoni that the claimed wireless communication unit is being equated to a mobile switching center (MSC) on the second communication network. The MSC, however, is similar to the gateway station disclosed in Shin. Rimoni's MSC and Shin's gateway station perform similar functions. Thus, with reference to the reasons provided for Shin, it is respectfully submitted that the Rimoni's MSC is not same as Applicants claimed wireless communication unit.

Rimoni is cited for the claimed limitation "the handover is initiated by a handover call made by the wireless communication unit on the second communication network." Applicants respectfully submit that according to paragraph [0370] of Rimoni the handover is made by the mobile switching node (MSN) rather by the wireless communication unit. The prior art teaches that the handover call is made by network infrastructure component, e.g. Shin's gateway controller and Rimoni's MSN. On the other hand, the claims require that the handover call be made by a different component. That element, the wireless communication unit, is not a part of the network infrastructure. Applicants have therefore moved the unit making the handover call out of the infrastructure. Thus, it is not obvious to the person of ordinary skilled in the art to have

the handover call made by the wireless communication unit when the prior art consistently teaches that the call is made by a network infrastructure component. Moreover, the handover call disclosed in Rimoni is made between MSN on the first communication network to the MSC on the second communication network. As such, the prior art teaches that the handover call is made from an infrastructure component in the first communication network to an infrastructure component on the second network. But Applicants' claims require that the handover call is made by the wireless communication unit on the second communication network to a mobility manager on the first communication network. In other words, Applicants' claims require the handover call go in the opposite direction than what is taught by the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shin and Rimoni does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the claimed wireless communication unit, mobility manager and method. In particular, the cited combination fail to disclose, teach or otherwise disclose (1) the mobility manager being in the first communication network, (2) the wireless communication unit making the handover call and (3) that the wireless communication unit makes the call from the second communication network to the first communication network. Applicants therefore submit that the independent claims 1, 9 and 23 are non-obvious over the cited references. In addition, it is submitted that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-13 and 15-22, which depend upon claim 9 and claims 24-29 and 31-39, which depend upon claim 23, are also non-obvious over the cited references for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the

Serial No. 10/674,254
Belkin et al
Case No. CE11195R

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to
50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Belkin, Anatoly S., et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750